

**REMARKS**

35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 4-16, 19-31, 34, 45, 48, 59, and 60 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 16, and 59 are rejected for reciting “overridden by any existing.” Applicants amend claims 1 and 16 to replace “ordered using the linguistic database ordering overridden by any existing dynamic reordering frequency count” with “wherein the order of words determined by the RDB are displayed before the order of words determined by the LDB.” Thus, the ordering of words determined by the LDB is only overridden when the RDB provides an ordering of words. As a result, claims 1 and 16 provide a limitation and boundaries and are therefore definite. Claim 59 is cancelled.

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected for reciting “providing a user database (UDB) separate from the LDB which stores defined words that the user specifically enters into the system and which includes a reorder database (RDB) that stores database object numbers.”

Applicants amend claims 1 and 16 to recite that the object numbers are stored in the RDB and are only assigned to words contained in the LDB. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 8 lines 21-27. Thus, the claims have support in the specification and are therefore clear and definite.

Because claims 4-15, 19-31, 34, 45, and 48 depend upon either amended claim 1 or 16, they are also definite. Claims 59 and 60 are cancelled.

35 USC 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 4-16, 19-31, 34, 45, and 48 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected for failing to comply with the written description requirement because they recited that user defined words had object numbers. Applicants amend claims 1 and 16 to recite that only words contained in the LDB are associated with object numbers. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 8 lines 21-27. Thus, claims 1 and 16 are supported by the specification. Because claims 4-15, 19-31, 34, 45, and 48 depend upon either amended claim 1 or 16, they are also supported by the specification.

35 USC 102(e)

Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by King. In the interest of furthering prosecution, claims 59 and 60 are cancelled.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully posit that the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record, and that all rejections of the claims have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all claims. The Examiner is invited to please contact Applicants' agent at (650) 474-8400 should any questions arise.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Elizabeth Ruzich".

Elizabeth Ruzich

Reg. No. 54,416

Customer No. 22,862